

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action mailed on October 25, 2006. This response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 10-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Holmes. Examiner says that “Holmes discloses that during MEDTEX ’03, the advantages of spider silk were disclosed and that spider silk was used by Rakhima Alimova in Uzbekistan for flossing teeth.”

Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes.

Claims 10-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcon (US 6102050).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Applicant respectfully wishes to point out that Holmes does not at all say “that spider silk was used by Rakhima Alimova in Uzbekistan for flossing teeth”. The only mention of spider silk in the Holmes article is on page 39 near the top of the third column under the heading “Advantages of spider silk”, where it is stated that “spider silk was said by Prof. Ir Lieva Van Langenhowe to form an excellent scaffold for tissue engineering and for cartilage generation”. This has nothing to do with flossing. On page 40, which discusses techniques for limiting bacterial growth and infections, Holmes reports that Rakhima Alimova in Uzbekistan has a “most unusual use for silk thread...Research has shown in a study carried out on children with caries that improvements were detected after application of natural silk to the caries”. Please note that this has nothing to do with flossing; flossing is never mentioned here. Rather it is application of natural silk, not spider silk, to deal with caries (tooth decay). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection over Holmes is not proper and is successfully traversed.

The rejection over Marcon is also respectfully traversed. In a previous response, it was pointed out that silkworm silk and spider silk are NOT equivalent materials. It is known in the art of materials engineering, that spider silk has superior elongation and strength to that of silkworm silk. (It is analogous to saying that an item may be constructed from alloy steel or stainless steel – it does not mean that they are equivalent materials and indeed they have very different properties.) This point was also discussed in the telephone interview and it is believed that the Examiner understood and accepted this point.

Accordingly, all the claims of record are respectfully deemed patentable over the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DEKEL PATENT LTD.

BY David Klein

David Klein, Patent Agent

Reg. No. 41,118

Tel 972-8-949-5334

Fax 972-949-5323

E-mail: [dekelltd@netvision.net.il](mailto:dekelltd@netvision.net.il)